IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)
TUESDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR
PRESENT
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU
WRIT PETITION NO : 8747 of 2004

Between:
B.Raju, S/o.Late Balachander
R/o.4/210, Chuttala Basti, Ramgopalpet, Secunderabad.
..... PETITIONER

AND
1 Works Manager (ZHB-NZ)APSRTC, Uppal, Hyderabad.
2 The Regional Manager, APSRTC, Hyderabad City Region, Secunderabad.
3 The Vice Chairman & Managing Director, APSRTC, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.
.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an order more particularly in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents herein to implement the orders of this Hon'ble court in WA 366/ 99 dt.16-3-99 and consequently direct the respondent herein to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground in any suitable post in the respondents corporation and to pass.

For the Petitioner: MR.P.SURESH

For the Respondents: MR.K.HARINATH, Standing Counsel for

APSRTC

The Court Made the Following:

ORDER:

The petitioner's father, while working in A.P.S.R.T.C. Uppal Bus Depot died on 08.04.1993, by which date the petitioner was minor. On 06.06.1996 the petitioner attained majority and filed representation to the third respondent seeking employment to him on compassionate grounds and the same was rejected mainly on the ground that the application was time barred. Questioning the same, a writ petition No.1586 of 1999 was filed, which was dismissed. Against the said order W.A.No.366 of 1999 was filed where under a Division Bench of this Court directed the respondents to consider the question of relaxation of instructions in the circulars as regards the time-limit prescribed for submitting the application on compassionate grounds and also held that the appellant can make a further representation within a period of four weeks from that day. The writ petitioner's case will have to be considered *denovo* in the light of the observations within a period of three months thereof. But the respondents did not pass any orders on the representation filed by the petitioner herein. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition is filed.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that in spite of giving direction by this Court, the respondents have not considered the case of the petitioner, though the petitioner gave a representation to the third respondent on 02.02.2001.

The learned standing counsel appearing for the

respondents contended that certain time may be fixed for consideration of the representation of the petitioner dated 02.02.2001 enabling the respondents to pass appropriate orders. The facts are not in dispute.

The grievance of the petitioner is that in pursuance of the direction given by this Court, the case of the petitioner has not been considered *denovo* within a period prescribed by this Court. The appointment on compassionate grounds have to be considered and decided by the respondents in the light of rules and regulations of the corporation.

Therefore, the respondents are directed to dispose of the representation of the petitioner dated 02.02.2001 within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly. In the circumstance of the case there shall be no order as to costs.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

Copy to:

1 Works Manager (ZHB-NZ)APSRTC, Uppal, Hyderabad.

2 The Regional Manager, APSRTC, Hyderabad City Region, Secunderabad.

3 The Vice Chairman & Managing Director, APSRTC,

Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

4 2 C.D. copies.